· ·	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	10/005,649	KIM ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Chirag G. Shah	2664
All Participants:	Status of Application:	
(1) <u>Chirag G. Shah</u> .	(3)	
(2) Jeffrey M. Glabicki, Reg. # 42,584.	(4)	
Date of Interview: 20 March 2006	Time:	!
Type of Interview: ☐ Telephonic ☐ Video Conference ☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicat Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No If Yes, provide a brief description:	ant's representative)	
		. 4
Part I.		
Rejection(s) discussed:		
Claims discussed: Claims 7 and 11-13 and 15-16		
Prior art documents discussed:		
Part II.		. DIGGLIGGED.
SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED: See Continuation Sheet		
Part III.		·
 It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability. It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above. 		
,		
a. 1.1	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
Jan 3/20/08		
(Examiner/SPE Signature) (Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)		

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Claim 7, lines 14 and 17 requires a said prior to the respective communication burst; Claim 11 depends from a canceled claim 9; and claims 12-13 and 15-16 continue to read on prior art. Applicant and Examiner agreed that the Examiner may make an Examiner's Amendment to resolve the antecedent issue with respect to claim 7, change the dependency in claim 11 to 7 instead of 9 and cancel to claim 12-13 and 15-16.